

Serial No. 10/027,163

Attorney Docket No. PF02257NA

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 20 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended.

Claims 1 through 4, 6, 8, 11 through 13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,584,494 to Manabe, et al. ("Manabe, et al. patent") and U.S. Patent No. 6,784,899 to Barrus, et al. ("Barrus, et al. patent"). Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Manabe, et al. patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,604 to Ogle, et al. ("Ogle, et al. patent"). Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Manabe, et al. patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,301,609 to Aravamudan, et al. ("Aravamudan, et al. patent"). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Manabe, et al. patent in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0048615 to Kato, et al. ("Kato, et al. publication").

Claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, "retrieving configuration data of the target device based on the target identification, the configuration data including a plurality of classes and a plurality of canned replies associated with the plurality of classes" and "identifying an originating class of the originating device from the plurality of classes and a canned reply associated with the originating class based on the originating identification". Also, claim 11 provides, *inter alia*, "a messaging server for communicating with a plurality of client devices, the messaging server being effective to receive a communication message directed to a target device from an originating device, retrieve a plurality of classes and a plurality of canned replies

Serial No. 10/027,163

Attorney Docket No. PF02257NA

associated with the target device, identify an originating class of the originating device from the plurality of classes and a canned reply associated with the originating class based on the originating device, and send the canned reply to the originating device if the target device is unavailable for interactive communication with the originating device". Support for the above additional recitation is provided at page 5, lines 10 through 14; page 6, line 16, through page 7, line 7; page 12, Table 1; and page 20, Table 3, of the specification.

Thus, when a source device sends a message to a target device, the message includes a target ID so that classes and canned replies associated with the target device may be retrieved. The message also includes a source ID so that the source device may be categorized in a particular class and a canned reply associated with the particular class may be identified. In summary, the appropriate canned reply is selected by identifying the possible classes based on the target device and selecting a particular one of these classes based on the originating device.

In contrast, the Manabe, et al. patent, the Barrus, et al. patent, the Ogle, et al. patent, the Aravamudan, et al. patent, and Kato, et al. publication do not describe or suggest retrieving classes and canned replies based on a target identification and identifying one of these classes and an associated canned reply based on the originating identification, as required by amended claims 1 and 11. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 distinguish patentably from the Manabe, et al. patent, the Barrus, et al. patent, the Ogle, et al. patent, the Aravamudan, et al. patent, Kato, et al. publication, and any combination of these references.

Claims 2 through 10 and 12 through 20 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 1 and 11 as amended, respectively. Therefore, claims 2 through 10 and 12

Serial No. 10/027,163

Attorney Docket No. PF02257NA

through 20 distinguish patentably from the Manabc, et al. patent, the Barrus, et al. patent, the Ogle, et al. patent, the Aravamudan, et al. patent, Kato, et al. publication, and any combination of these references for the reasons stated above for amended claims 1 and 11.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 through 20 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any


Serial No. 10/027,163

Attorney Docket No. PF02257NA

questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Couts, Jeffrey, et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048


Hisashi D. Watanabe
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350

03/01/06
Date